

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,351	10/29/2003	Kenneth F. Buechler	36671-716.302	7522
80984 Inverness Med	7590 11/17/200 lical Innovations / WSG	EXAMINER		
Wilson Sonsin	i Goodrich & Rosati, P.	ALEXANDER, LYLE		
650 Page Mill Palo Alto, CA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
10/697,351		BUECHLER, KENNETH F.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LYLE A. ALEXANDER	1797	

	LYLE A. ALEXANDER	1797						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 09 January 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
<ol> <li>X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
<ul> <li>The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire it</li> </ul>	riod for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In nt, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1:							
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may be reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	nally set in the final Office	e action; or (2) as					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	iled within two months	s of the date of					
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further contains a final rejection.</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause					
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for</li> </ul>								
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a ∈	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).					
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ol>								
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).		•						
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided.</li> </ol>		be entered and an e	xplanation of					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .								
Claim(s) rejected: 1.4.5 and 8.								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	t before or on the date of filing a No	tion of Annual will not	be entered					
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to compare the date of the	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary								
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
11. \( \sum \) The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.								
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)   13.  Other:								
	/LYLE A ALEXANDER/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1797						

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Upon further appeal and entry of the 9/16/09 amendments, the Office will vacate the 35 USC 102 rejections over Findlay et al. and Wu in favor of 35 USC 103 rejections similar to those of record (e.g. Findlay et al. or Wu in view of Oosta et al. stating it would have been obvious to include a second layer to promote capillary flow). Applicants' argue the cited prior at fails to teach the claimed "resturred surface". .. between 1nm and 0.5mm). The Office maintains the position of record that it would have be the inherent the cited prior art would have he ad surface imperfections that would meet the instant claims. Applicants also argue the cited prior art fails to the claimed "... antibodies of fragments thereof bind specifically to said one or more target ligands". The Office maintains the instant claim language is open and does not exclude additional binder alseys that may be performed by the cited prior art and the instant language is sufficiently broad to have been properly read on the taught antibody/target ligand interaction of the cited orior art.